

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT**

DENNIS MONTGOMERY,

Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

JAMES RISEN, et al.,

Defendants-Appellees.

No. 16-7096

APPELLANT’S RENEWED REQUEST FOR ORAL ARGUMENT

Plaintiff-Appellant Dennis Montgomery (“Montgomery”) hereby respectfully requests that this Court hold the originally scheduled oral arguments and reschedule them for the next mutually convenient time and date, if possible between September 29 and October 8, 2017, as the undersigned counsel will at a minimum be present at criminal trial thereafter that will last approximately 2-3 months in Las Vegas, Nevada involving Defendant Cliven Bundy. He can take a day from pre-trial preparation to travel to Washington, D.C. to participate in oral arguments before this Court between these suggested dates. Oral arguments are necessary because the appellate record is very voluminous and complicated, and Montgomery requests oral arguments in order to ensure that this Court fully understands and does not accidentally misconstrue the record. Montgomery was not afforded oral argument in the lower court once the matter was transferred from

the Southern District of Florida to the District of Columbia. Montgomery believes that the lower court misunderstood and misconstrued the voluminous record in reaching its decision, and would like to avoid this again at this stage. Thus, oral argument is necessary and would aid in the administration of justice and due process under the law.

Dated: September 18, 2017

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Larry Klayman
Larry Klayman, Esq.
Klayman Law Group, P.A.
2020 Pennsylvania Avenue N.W.,
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20006
(310) 595-0800
leklayman@gmail.com
Attorney for Plaintiff -Appellant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on September 18, 2017, I filed this document with the Clerk of Court using CM/ECF, which will serve this document on all counsel of record.

/s/ Larry Klayman
Larry Klayman, Esq.

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

1. This document complies with the type-volume limit of Circuit Rule 27(d)(2)(A) because this document contains 194 words, less than the 5,200 words allowed under this rule.
2. This document complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P.

32(a)(5) and the type-style requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6) because this document has been prepared in a proportionally spaced typeface using Microsoft Word 15.28 in 14-point Times New Roman.

/s/ *Larry Klayman*
LARRY KLAYMAN, ESQ.